

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MITCHELL WINE,
Plaintiff,

v.

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION
BOARD, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-03336-JCS

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT**

Re: Dkt. No. 61

On October 6, 2025, Plaintiff brought a motion “request[ing] rulings ‘forthwith’ and immediately on all pending matters, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3771.” Dkt. no. 58 (“Motion to Expedite”) at p. 2. Previously, Plaintiff had asked the Court to decide the pending motions in the case without a hearing, asserting that the issues raised in the substantive motions were fully briefed and that a hearing was not required. *See* dkt. no. 47. On October 7, 2025, the Court ruled on all of the substantive motions pending in the case and vacated the scheduled motion hearing. Dkt. no. 59. Because the only relief requested in the Motion to Expedite was an immediate ruling on the substantive motions, the Court denied that motion as moot. *Id.* Having dismissed all of Plaintiff’s claims, the Court entered judgment in the case.

Plaintiff now asks the Court to vacate the judgment and reopen the case, apparently seeking substantive rulings related to his rights under the Crime Victims’ Rights Act (“CVRA”), 18 U.S.C. § 3771. *See* dkt. no. 61 (“Motion”). Plaintiff has pointed to no authority, however, suggesting that the rights afforded to crime victims under the CVRA apply to the proceedings in this case, which is not a criminal prosecution. *See In re Wild*, 994 F.3d 1244, 1269 (11th Cir. 2021) (holding that CVRA did not provide crime victim “with a private right of action to enforce

her rights outside of the context of a preexisting criminal proceeding.”); *see also In re Doe*, 50 F.4th 1247, 1251 (9th Cir. 2022) (citing *In re Wild* with approval).

Accordingly, the Motion is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 8, 2025



JOSEPH C. SPERO
United States Magistrate Judge